

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District	Amount Requested	\$260,000
------------------	--	-------------------------	-----------

Proposal Title	Finnon Lake Restoration and Habitat Improvement Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$1,761,400
-----------------------	---	----------------------------	-------------

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The project involves reconstruction of the embankment (constructed in 1905 by PG&E) restoring 350 acre-feet of water storage. Engineering analysis states, “seismic instability of the embankment could liquefy the fill material if subjected to a Maximum Credible Earthquake”. This project would restore a valuable economic and natural watershed resource while enhancing fishery and aquatic habitats, improving wetland habitats, improving upland forested habitats, and securing a sustainable water supply to combat wildfires.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	3/12
Budget	1/5		
Schedule	1/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	6/12
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			29

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The applicant states that the Project is ready for implementation, and that the lake is drained, but there are no technical documents, schematics, or maps included to show construction level details. The applicant indicates that work and studies have already been completed, but no examples of those studies are included. No plans or specifications are included though the applicant states they are complete under the ‘Completed Work’ section. Within the ‘Completed Work’ section of the application, the applicant states “California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and all other permits have been obtained.” However, insufficient supporting detail is provided, as there is no documentation as to the type of CEQA document completed and list or explanation of which specific permits have been obtained.

Budget

The Proposal does not contain detail Budget information for any component of the Project. In addition, the Budget lacks detail as cost share is only provided in bulk amounts and lump sums in relation to Budget categories. The level of detail included in the budget section is as follows “(a) Direct Project Administration Costs: Non-State: 26,000; Requested Grant Funding: 5,000; Other State Funds Being Used: 60,000; Total: 91,000.” No further information such as number of hours, hourly wages, disciplines, or supplies needed are included. With inadequate detail, costs cannot be verified nor considered reasonable. As clearly stated in the Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP), page 31 “The detailed Budget should be commensurate with the design stage that is being submitted and be broken out by task used in the Work Plan...”. The tasks shown on the Budget must agree with the tasks described in the Work Plan and shown in the Schedule in Attachments 3 and 5.”

Schedule

The Schedule does not follow the work items presented in the Work Plan and Budget, and is not completely reasonable. Schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation more than 12 months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). For example, task 4 in the schedule is “Remove existing embankment” and “Remove Dam,” while task 4 of the Work Plan is “Planning Design and Specifications.” Task 8 in the Work Plan is the construction component which lists 14 sub-tasks that explain all the work that will be done for construction. In the Schedule section, there is no Construction task. It is noted that the Schedule does include a “reconstruction of embankment” but it is uncertain if this activity encompasses the construction components of the Project as listed in the Work Plan. Also, a key deliverable (“Quarterly Reports”) is not listed, and the color codes used in the Schedule are not explained as to what they represent.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Not all Project Goal targets demonstrate that they will be met within the life of the Proposal. For example, Project Goal No.4 has an outcome indicator that involves monitoring “every 2 to 3 years” which won’t show that target goal being met within the life of the proposal. Also, the measurement tools and methods for Project Goal 2 could have been better explained. Project Goal 2 states, “Improve upland forested habitats” and the measurement tool is “Photo monitoring”. Without more information in the measurement tool section it is difficult to determine if the measurement tool of “photo monitoring” will accurately monitor for the desired goal. More quantitative measurement tool would have been beneficial.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

Only low levels of Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this Proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. Total project cost is \$2.37 million in 2009 present value (PV). FDR benefits are quantified (at a value of \$0.27 million in PV), but no documentation is provided to support the numbers used. The application states that the Flood Rapid Assessment Model (FRAM) model was used, but the input data are not shown or justified. Also, physical quantities of water supply benefits are included in Table 15, but the numbers are not documented or even described.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits:

Average levels of Water Quality and Other benefits can be realized through this proposal, however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Water

quality and other benefits are described briefly, including recreation and habitat improvement. Changes in physical measures of benefits are summarized, but not documented. Some of the recreation facilities described do not appear to be part of or affected by the proposed project.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Contribute to Attainment of One or More of the Objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Practice Integrated Flood Management, and Expand Environmental Stewardship. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.